

## REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 42 and 43 are amended, leaving claims 27-49 pending with claims 27, 36 and 42 independent. No new matter is entered.

Claims 36-49 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 36 and 42 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Applicants submit that the structure of each is positively specified and any indefinite language has been amended.

Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36-38 and 40-48 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub 2003/0174729 to Heink et al.

Amended independent claim 27 recites, among other things, a method for transmitting information via a packet-oriented communication network, including inserting the information that is to be transmitted as payload into a payload-field of a data packet of the packet-oriented communication network, inserting target information into the data packet, adding an information field to the payload to identify over which subscriber information line the payload is to be transmitted.

The Examiner suggests that Heink discloses a destination MAC added to the Ethernet frame. As noted by the Examiner, [0068] states that the Ethernet encapsulating unit generates a DMAC-address for the destination ATM-Port Module. However, Heink fails to disclose or render obvious the insertion of both target information into the data packet and adding an information field to the payload to identify over which subscriber information line the payload is to be transmitted. The system as claimed allows the information to be sent to a target (e.g. AE1 to z) using the target information and then forwarded in over the subscriber information line using the information field. Such a system is clearly not disclosed or taught by Heink.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 27 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Independent claims 36 and 42 and their respective dependent claims are allowable for substantially similar reasons.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heink in view of USPN 6,728,261 to Sasson et al.

Since Sasson does not overcome the deficiencies of Heink, claim 29 is allowable for the reasons expressed above.

Claims 32, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heink in view of Roberts.

Since Roberts does not overcome the deficiencies of Heink, claims 32, 35 and 39 are allowable for the reasons expressed above.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heink in view of Roberts and USPN 6,515,963 to Bechtolsheim et al.

Since Bechtolsheim does not overcome the deficiencies of Heink and Roberts, claim 49 is allowable for the reasons expressed above.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Jeffrey J. Howell

Reg. No. 46,402

Customer No. 29180

Dated: December 27, 2007